



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/732,827	12/10/2003	Ann Maric Przepasniak	KCX-660 (19116)	6772
22827	7590	08/10/2007		
DORITY & MANNING, P.A. POST OFFICE BOX 1449 GREENVILLE, SC 29602-1449			EXAMINER CHAPMAN, GINGER T	
			ART UNIT 3761	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 08/10/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/732,827

Applicant(s)

PRZEPASNIAK ET AL.

Examiner

Ginger T. Chapman

Art Unit

3761

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 July 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 4 and 7 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 5, 6 and 8-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 10 December 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Terminal Disclaimer

The terminal disclaimer filed on 30 July 2007 disclaiming the terminal portion of any patent granted on this application which would extend beyond the expiration date of US Patent No. 7,138,560 B2 has been reviewed and is accepted. The terminal disclaimer has been recorded.

The terminal disclaimer filed on 30 July 2007 disclaiming the terminal portion of any patent granted on this application which would extend beyond the expiration date of any patent granted on Application Number 10/326,912 has been reviewed and is accepted. The terminal disclaimer has been recorded.

Status of the claims

Claims 1-16 are pending in the application, claims 4 and 7 are withdrawn from consideration as being drawn to a nonelected invention.

Specification

The use of the trademark MOCON has been noted in this application. It should be capitalized wherever it appears and be accompanied by the generic terminology.

Although the use of trademarks is permissible in patent applications, the proprietary nature of the marks should be respected and every effort made to prevent their use in any manner which might adversely affect their validity as trademarks. In patent specifications, every

Art Unit: 3761

ingredient of the product should be set forth in positive, exact, intelligible language, so that there will be no uncertainty as to what is meant. Arbitrary trademarks which are liable to mean different things at the pleasure of manufacturers do not constitute such language. *Ex Parte Kattwinkle*, 12 USPQ 11 (Bd. App. 1931). Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 1-3, 5-6 and 8-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zhao et al (US 6,514,602 B1) in view of Blaney et al (US 6,663,611 B2) in view of Bewick-Sonntag et al (US 6,232,521 B1) and further in view of Grenier (US 5,613,964).

With regard to claim 1, as seen in Figure 1, Zhao et al disclose an interlabial absorbent article (20) configured for disposition primarily within the vestibule (c. 13, l. 37) of a female wearer (fig. 5), comprising a generally liquid permeable, non-apertured cover sheet (42) comprising a first material (c. 14, ll. 52-53; see also c. 11, ll. 49-65, teaching preferred cover sheets are high loft nonwovens topsheets, while especially preferred being apertured formed film topsheets), a generally liquid impermeable back sheet (38) comprising a second material, said second material different than the first (c. 13, ll. 9-10), an absorbent material (44) disposed between the cover sheet (42) and back sheet (38).

With regard to the limitation of the back sheet having a water vapor transmission rate (WVTR) at least about 20% of the cover sheet WVTR, Zhao does not explicitly disclose ratios of WVT rates. Zhao, at c. 2, ll. 45-55, expresses the desire for a flushable backsheet for interlabial

Art Unit: 3761

articles that are comfortable for the wearer and not sticky during use, i.e. breathable, when used in hot and humid environments (c. 3, l. 30). Zhao, at c. 7, ll. 38-42 teaches backsheets having moisture vapor transmission rates (MVTR) of at least about 500 g/m²/24 hours to at least about 1000 g/m²/24 hours.

The examiner notes that WVTR and MVTR are expressed in the same units, i.e. g/m²/24 hours while Applicant has chosen to express WVTR in the non-conventional units of Mocon values, derived from the company that makes the particular test equipment used.

Blaney et al, at c. 3, ll. 10-25, teaches the ability of cover sheets and outer sheets to have different relative levels of breathability for wearer comfort, i.e. different vapor transmission rates, thus disclosing a desire for such. Blaney teaches an absorbent article (2) having a cover sheet (16) that has a water vapor transmission rate that is at least about 20% of a water vapor transmission rate of the back sheet (c. 7, ll. 15-35). In view of the teachings of Blaney, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to form the back and cover sheets having the claimed ratio of WVTR since one of ordinary skill in the art would only have to reverse the configuration taught by Blaney to obtain the claimed limitation, and it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. *In re Leshin*, 125 USPQ 416.

Zhao discloses the claimed invention except for the limitation of the cover sheet and back sheet having a contact angle mismatch of less than about 25%. Zhao, at c. 12, ll. 25-26 and c. 19, l. 25, teaches the ability of the cover and back sheets to have different degrees of wettability, thus disclosing a desire for such. Bewick-Sonntag, at c. 1, ll. 25-40, expresses the desire to

Art Unit: 3761

reduce leakage from breathable backsheets. As seen in Figures 3 and 4 (see also c. 7, ll. 25-45), Bewick-Sonntag teaches the use of materials having different contact angles in an absorbent article to create a hydrophobic gradient thereby reducing backsheet leakage. Bewick-Sonntag teaches a contact angle mismatch between the absorbent core and the backsheet instead of the cover sheet and the backsheet, and also teaches at c. 2, ll. 23-35 that the same gradient principles apply with the cover sheet and a breathable backsheet. Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to form the cover and back sheets of Zhao having the claimed contact angle mismatch as taught by Bewick-Sonntag since Bewick-Sonntag states at c. 2, ll. 1-4 that the benefit of such a modification is that allows the use of a thin breathable backsheet that maintains the required level of protection.

With regard to the limitation of the article having an initial neutral buoyancy and sinks within about 7 days from being flushed, Zhao, at c. 1, ll. 50-60, expresses the desire for an interlabial pad that can be flushed down a toilet without clogging it or the sewage pipes. Grenier, at c. 10, ll. 35-45, teaches the ability of an absorbent article to be flushed down a toilet without clogging the plumbing by providing an article that is neutrally buoyant and remains substantially intact, thus disclosing a desire for such. Grenier teaches that if the article is neutrally buoyant and remains substantially intact, this enables it to be carried along with other waste in a moving stream of wastewater. Grenier further teaches at c. 10, ll. 50-55 that the materials and construction of a sanitary absorbent article can be selected to achieve an article which provides neutral buoyancy. As seen in Figure 1, Grenier teaches an absorbent article wherein upon being flushed, the article remains intact and has an initial neutral buoyancy. Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the

Art Unit: 3761

invention was made to form the article of Zhao having neutral buoyancy as taught by Grenier since Grenier states at c. 10, ll. 37 that the benefit of forming the article with this design is that it can be flushed without clogging the toilet, plumbing pipes, drain lines and sewers as it travels along the waste stream.

With regard to the limitation of the article sinks within about 7 days of being flushed, Grenier teaches the article remains neutrally buoyant and substantially intact as it is carried along with other waste from the toilet plumbing fixtures, through drain lines and sewers, therefore examiner has reasonable basis to believe the article remains intact for the duration of its voyage along the waste stream, said voyage would reasonably take within 7 days. Additionally, 7 days fails to further limit the article, because it does not contain any other structural limitations of the device and floating time is not the limitation of the device; therefore Zhao/Grenier disclose the device substantially as claimed.

With regard to claims 2 and 3, Zhao teaches a cover sheet of rayon and film (c. 14, l. 50-60). Zhao discloses the claimed materials and the ability of the material to have a water vapor transmission rate of at least about 30,000 Mocon value is inherent in the material.

When the structure or the composition recited in the reference is substantially identical to that of the claims of the instant invention, claimed properties or functions are presumed to be inherent (MPEP § 2112-2112.01). A prima facie case of either anticipation or obviousness has been established when the reference discloses all the limitations of a claim, (in this case, a cover sheet of rayon and film) except for a property or function (in the present case a water vapor transmission rate of at least about 30,000 Mocon value) and the examiner reasonably believes

Art Unit: 3761

that the reference inherently possesses properties that anticipate or render obvious the claimed invention and thus has a basis for shifting the burden of proof to applicant, as per *In re Fitzgerald*, 619 F.2d 67, 205 USPQ 594 (CCPA 1980).

As a practical matter, the Patent Office is not equipped to manufacture products by the myriad of processes put before it and then obtain prior art products and make physical comparisons therewith." *In re Brown*, 459 F.2d 531, 535, 173 USPQ 685, 688 (CCPA 1972).

The burden of proof has thus shifted to Applicants to come forward with evidence that the prior art would not exhibit the claimed WVTR Mocon values when tested according to the same procedures as Applicant's invention.

With regard to claim 5, Zhao teaches the back sheet comprises a highly breathable stretch thermal laminate (c. 7, ll. 20-45). With regard to the limitation of at least about 10,000 Mocon value, Zhao discloses the claimed materials and the ability of the material to have a water vapor transmission rate of at least about 30,000 Mocon value is inherent in the material.

The burden of proof has thus shifted to Applicants to come forward with evidence that the prior art would not exhibit the claimed WVTR Mocon values when tested according to the same procedures as Applicant's invention. See claims 2 and 3, *supra*.

With respect to the limitation of the WVTR (expressed as Mocon values), Applicant's specification contains no disclosure of either the critical nature of the claim limitations nor any unexpected results arising therefrom, and that as such the limitations were arbitrary and therefore obvious. Such unsupported limitations cannot be the basis for patentability, since where

Art Unit: 3761

patentability is said to be based upon particular dimensions or another variable in the claim, the applicant must show that the chosen variables are critical. *In re Woodruff*, 919 F.2d 1575, 1578, 16 USPQ 2d 1934 (Fed. Cir. 1990). One having ordinary skill in the art would be able to determine the ideal water vapor transmission rates for a particular sheet.

With regard to claims 6 and 7, see claims 2 and 3 and 5, *supra*.

With regard to claims 8 and 9, Grenier teaches the absorbent material has wet and dry densities of at least about 1.0 g/cc (col. 11, ll. 66-67 to col. 12, ll. 1-35) in order to provide neutral buoyancy to the article. Grenier teaches that the density of water is 1.0 g/cc and thus material having about the same density of water, i.e. about 1.0 g/cc, would be neutrally buoyant in water (col. 12, l. 16).

Grenier teaches that flushability is determined by density, volume and bulkiness (c. 11, l. 66) which determines buoyancy in water and that density of the material improves performance when disposed of by flushing (col. 11, ll. 16-17), and further teaches optimizing these parameters to obtain desired flushability properties, i.e. neutral buoyancy (col. 11, l. 7) in the known process of selecting materials that are intended to be flushed (col. 12, ll. 15-35). Therefore density of the absorbent material is a result effective variable that can be varied to obtain varying buoyancy characteristics. In view of the teachings of Grenier, discovery of the optimum value of density in the process of obtaining an article that is neutrally buoyant in water as taught by Grenier for the flushable menstrual article of Zhao would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, since it has been held that discovery of optimum values

Art Unit: 3761

of result effective variables in a known process involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Boesch and Slaney*, 617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980).

With regard to claim 10, With regard to claim 10, Zhao discloses the cover sheet (42) is adhered to the back sheet (38) with an adhesive (col. 16, l. 21) around a circumference of the article (col. 16, l. 16).

With regard to claim 11, Zhao discloses the absorbent material comprises a cotton/rayon blend (col. 15, ll. 43-44).

With regard to claim 12, see claims 1, 2, 8 and 9, *supra*.

With regard to claim 13, see claim 1, *supra*.

With regard to claim 14, see claims 1, 8 and 9, *supra*.

With regard to claim 15, see claim 1, *supra*.

With regard to claim 16, see claim 1 *supra*.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-3, 5-6 and 8-16 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ginger T. Chapman whose telephone number is (571) 272-4934. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 9:30 a.m. to 6:00 p.m..

Art Unit: 3761

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tatyana Zalukaeva can be reached on (571) 272-1115. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Ginger Chapman
Examiner, Art Unit 3761
08/06/07



TATYANA ZALUKAEVA
SUPERVISORY PRIMARY EXAMINER

